

REMARKS

Claims 2, 5-7, 9 and 12-14 are pending upon entry of this amendment. Claims 3, 4, 10 and 11 have been cancelled. Claims 5-7 and 12-14 have been amended. The amendment is supported by, e.g., Fig. 2 of applicants' specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Ishikawa. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6, as amended, recites a controller that sets a size of the block of the data to be compressed to a *size of the page unit* when an attribute of the data is binary data, and to a *size of a divisional unit* obtained by dividing the size of the page unit by plural numbers when the attribute of the data is multi-valued data. Ishikawa fails to disclose or suggest this feature. In Ishikawa's device, an image is always divided into a plurality of range blocks BR of KxL pixels and the data range block BR is therefore never set to a size of the page unit, as recited in amended claim 6. In addition, col. 7, lines 39-47 of Ishikawa, which the Examiner compares to the claimed binary data and multi-valued data, merely discloses setting the destiny of a single pixel rather than the size of the range block BR. Ishikawa therefore fails to disclose that the size of the range blocks in set based on whether the data is binary or multi-valued, as recited in amended claim 6.

Claim 6 is allowable for the foregoing reasons. Claim 13, as amended, recites similar features as claim 6 and is also allowable.

Claims 2-5 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa in view of Abe. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5, as amended, recites a controller that sets a size of the block of the data to be compressed by said compressor to a *size of the page unit* when an attribute of the data is monochrome and to a *size of a divisional unit* obtained by dividing the size of the page unit by plural numbers when the attribute of the data is color. As discussed above, Ishikawa does not disclose or suggest setting the size of the block of data to a size of the page unit or a size of a

divisional unit depending on an attribute of the data. Abe similarly fails to disclose this feature. Abe discloses splitting a page into several blocks of data, as depicted in Fig. 3, and therefore essentially teaches away from setting the size of the block of the data to a size of the page unit as claimed. The combination of Ishikawa and Abe therefore fails to disclose this feature.

Claim 5 is allowable for the foregoing reasons. Claim 12, as amended, recites similar features as claim 5 and is also allowable. Claims 2 and 9 are allowable for their respective dependencies from claims 5 and 12.

Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa in view of Barnsley. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7, as amended, recites a controller that sets a size of the block of the data to be compressed by said compressor to a *size of the page unit* when an attribute of the data is a job other than a FAX/copy job and to a *size of a divisional unit* obtained by dividing the size of the page unit by plural numbers when the attribute of the data is the FAX/copy job. As discussed above, Ishikawa does not disclose or suggest setting the size of the block of data to a size of the page unit or a size of a divisional unit depending on an attribute of the data. Barnsley similarly fails to disclose this feature. Barnsley discloses compressing images using a plurality of image blocks, regardless of whether the data is a FAX/copy job. Barnsley, Figs. 1-3 and col. 8, lines 16-25. The combination of Ishikawa and Barnsley therefore fails to disclose this feature.

Claim 7 is allowable for the foregoing reasons. Claim 14, as amended, recites similar features as claim 7 and is also allowable.

In view of the above, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. **325772034800**.

Dated: January 6, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Amir Rohani

Registration No.: 61,782
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7757